The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., NOVEMBER 17, 1904. NO. 44.

SUPERSTITION OF MODERN INFIDELS.

THERE is no prouder boast of infidels than that "modern science and agnosticism have done away with superstition." Nothing, however, is more palpably false. It remains true that in proportion as faith wanes, superstition grows, or, as it has been expressed: "If faith leaves by the front entrance, superstition enters in by the back-door." It is not difficult to prove this statement from the lives of modern agnostics and atheists. Two recent biographies of notorious representatives of "modern thought" furnish a striking illustration.

The first is the life of Zola ('Emile Zola, Novelist and Reformer') which appeared a few months ago from the pen of Ernest Alfred Vizetelly, the translator of the French novelist's works. Vizetelly persistently views his subject from the standpoint of an enthusiastic admirer and friend and warmly pleads in defence of the many points in his hero's life that certainly need a defence, if the apostle of "naturalism" is to be represented as a great modern "reformer."

From the details concerning the personal life of Zola we select a few bearing on his superstition. He indulged in many superstitious habits. "At one time he would not go to bed until he had touched and retouched certain articles of furniture, and at another he was continually counting the gas-lamps in one street and adding the numbers of the houses in another. He was so susceptible to the terrors of a thunderstorm, that at Medan he would order all the shutters closed upon its approach, light all the lamps and bandage his eyes with a handkerchief. He fancied at times that his heart had moved into his arm or his thigh, and that he could feel it beating there, and he was acutely subject to attacks of physical pain. He could not wear tight garments, and even the

bed clothes must rest lightly upon him." (From a summary in the Boston *Evening Transcript*, August 31st, 1904.)

The second recent biography which furnishes interesting material is: 'Victor Hugo intime, par Mme. Richard Lesclide,' Paris, 1903. (See *Hochland*, February, 1904.) Victor Hugo, who loved to pose as "a great thinker and independent philosopher," was not only cynically immoral, but also ridiculously superstitious. He firmly believed in revelations of spirits by means of moving tables and wrapping on the walls. He never dared to undertake a journey on Friday, or to sit at a table where there were thirteen guests. He asserted, apparently in all earnest, that he possessed a manuscript dictated to him "spiritualistically" by the "Lion of Androcles." In order to please the spirits of the deceased, he had a large oak chair placed in his dining-room,—the "Sella Defunctorum," as he called it. An iron chain prevented any ordinary mortal from using this chair. This strange piece of furniture was marked with the "thoughtful" inscription: "The absent ones are present."

Not a few loudly declaim against the superstition of the "Dark Ages" and the aberration of the human mind manifested during the period of witch persecution. But people now-a-days show the very same propensity, as is clear from the vast business done by a host of impostors. A daily paper in that city of the East which boasts the title "American Athens," has often on one page not less than fifteen advertisements of clairvoyants, trance mediums, palmists, card readers, astrologers, etc., etc. If the lives of all the modern "esprits forts" were written in the same fashion, with the same amount of intimate information, as those of the two aforementioned Frenchmen, we should see that it is by no means merely the ignorant masses, the "profanum vulgus," who indulge in superstitious beliefs and practices.

It is true, modern education has done away with certain forms of popular superstition; but in most cases other forms have sprung up as rapidly as the old ones disappeared. If the world at large has freed itself from the frantic belief in witchcraft, it has readily accepted the equally absurd Spiritism. Education will not really destroy superstition, unless it is thoroughly Christian, if by thoroughly Christian we understand a clear and enlightened knowledge of the doctrines of faith. Hence, if the objection is raised that frequently believing Christians entertain superstitious notions, we answer that this deplorable phenomenon is not the logical outcome of religious belief as such, but of imperfections and defects of this belief. A man of truly enlightened faith, who clearly knows the Christian revelation about God's relation to this world, the wise laws of His kind providence, the use

He makes of creatures as instruments for bringing about the salvation of men, such a man, I say, will be proof against superstition. It is on pagan soil that superstition sprang up first; it began to grow when men, of their own free will, apostatized from God and thus caused the light of faith to grow dimn. The words of St. Paul to the Romans (I. 21, 22), explain the origin of superstition as well as of infidelity: "When they knew God, they have not glorified him as God, but became vain in their thoughts and their foolish heart was darkened. For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." In spite of the most strenuous efforts the Church has not been able to eradicate completely the remnants of pagan superstition, nor will she ever be able to free all her children from the bane of ignorance. Hence we must expect to find certain forms of superstition at all times even among a large number of believers.

But how is it possible that men who are proud of not being "like the rest of men," who do not care for the Lord's Day, who despise priests, sneer at the prophecies of Christ, and reject the whole Christian revelation, are so superstitious about Friday, listen to all sorts of impostors, and firmly believe in the predictions of card readers and revelations of "spirits"? Religion, that is the acknowledgment of our absolute dependence on God, is inborn, is natural to man. He can not rid himself altogether of the conviction, obscure and the vague as it may be, that there are beings above and beyond this visible universe, who stand in some relation to him; and he can not help feeling a desire of communicating with this invisible world. If the true faith has been cast aside, this feeling and this conviction will cling to phantastic objects of their own creation; if the reasonable service of intellect and will is refused to God, mind and heart will prostrate themselves before hideous and silly idols. On this account infidelity is the fertile soil on which the most absurd superstitions grow luxuriantly. "Professing themselves to be wise, they become fools," holds good of our modern infidels as well as of the pagans of old.

* * *

——The "Pyrheliophoro," or sun motor, exhibited at the World's Fair by a Portuguese priest, Rev. M. A. M. G. Himalaya, develops a new record in high temperature—over 3,600 degrees Fahrenheit—in which even asbestos chars and sometimes fuses, and seems to establish the theory that the origin of sun heat is electrical. It also shows that, no matter how high a temperature a substance may be subjected to, there is no change in its atomic composition. The Pyrheliophoro collects the rays of the sun through a huge reflector and throws them concentrated into the mouth of a small furnace.

THE STORY OF DR. EDWARD PREUSS' CONVERSION.

[As Told by Himself.]

XII.

On July 22nd, 1871, our Professor had made a contract with a prominent Lutheran publisher, who was a friend of his, by the terms of which a certain illustrated family journal, to whose columns he had already previously devoted a portion of his leisure hours, was to be developed into a weekly and considerably enlarged. His plan was by and by to devote himself entirely to this work.

During the terrible soul struggles previously outlined, this project was his only joy and consolation, because it seemed to offer him the opportunity to support his wife and child, and his old mother beyond the sea, without being compelled to teach and defend theories which daily became to him more intolerable.

But the merciful hand of God did not permit that this Lutheran Professor who had become shaky in his faith, should wearily plod along under the weight of unsatisfactory expedients and compromises.

It turned out that the President of the Synod harbored a different plan with regard to the periodical in question, a plan whereby it was to be placed under the immediate management of the Synod. As soon as our poor harassed Professor got authentic information of this fact, he relinquished his pet project which had grown so dear to him, even as duty required.

[I may add here, parenthetically, that the only effort made to impugn the purity of Dr. Preuss' motives after his conversion to the Catholic Church, on the part of the President of the Lutheran Synod, Dr. Walther, was a statement in the *Lutheraner*, that Dr. Preuss had planned to get control of the periodical referred to above without the knowledge and against the designs of his ecclesiastical superiors. We shall see further down how he refuted this accusation.—A. P.]

But what was he to do now? Already towards the end of November he had more than once, in his theological lectures, hardly been able to remain on his feet. Should he continue to torment himself almost beyond human endurance? Now that no hope seemed left to ever end these tortures?

No! It was impossible. He concluded that he would rather work on the rockpile than remain one day longer in this fiery furnace of Babylon.

And so he sat down and wrote to his mother and to a Lutheran friend for whom he felt a special veneration.

Then he went to his ecclesiastical superior, the President of

the Synod, and explained to him at length what had worried his soul for many moons.

On the first day of December, 1871, he resigned his professorship of theology, and already on the fifth he moved his furniture to a flat which he had rented.

Why did he hurry thus? It sounds strange, but he feared the eighth of December.

Still stranger to relate, he could not avoid that day. Circumstances which were entirely beyond his control made the eighth of December the date of his final departure.

All excited and unstrung, he arrived in his new home, far away on the outskirts of the city.

"The Mother of God, whom thou hast publicly accused of sin," an inner voice said to him, "is mightier than thou. Three years after the publication of thy pamphlet against her Immaculate Conception, she destroyed thy house in Berlin, which was by no means built upon a rock. To-day, three years later, on the feast of her Immaculate Conception, she robs thee of thy new home and of a treasure which was a thousand times dearer to thy soul—thy faith. That faith of which thou didst believe thyself to be a divinely ordained defender and to which thou hast devoted every spark of thy energy and every hour of thy early manhood."

Our Professor was indeed separated absolutely and forever from his Lutheran faith. His volume on the justification of the sinner before God he had thrown into the fire. The bulk of his Lutheran books he had sold; and it was only with a feeling of awful horror that he was able to recall to mind the chief doctrines of the old orthodox Lutheran faith which he had once loved.

What was to take the place of this faith in his now empty heart?

[*To be continued.*]

DR. McGLYNN'S RESTORATION AND THE SINGLE TAX THEORY.

To a communication to the press, part of which we quoted in a previous paper, Dr. McGlynn added these words: "I am particularly happy to be able to say that I found more than abundant consolation for some tribulations which I have suffered because of Mr. George's doctrines, in the fact that these tribulations brought out the explicit declaration from ecclesiastical authority that there was nothing in these doctrines contrary to the teachings of the Catholic religion."

A communication from Rondout, N. Y., Jan. 16th, 1893, runs as follows: "When asked whether the action of Msgr. Satolli in re-

instating Dr. McGlynn could be taken to mean that the Church itself advocated such views as Henry George and Dr. McGlynn held, Dr. Burtsell, said:.... 'Dr. McGlynn's restoration through the mediation of Msgr. Satolli is a simple declaration from the Holy See that his views of land ownership are permitted to be advocated by him, not being contrary to the laws of the Church. This, however, does not imply the conclusion that the Church itself advocates, or will advocate, such ideas in regard to land ownership and the theory of a single tax, for she has never yet come to any such conclusion. There is a great difference between deciding a thing to be not contrary to the Church's teachings, and the Church's teaching such beliefs herself. Dr. McGlynn's theories are now "free doctrine." People may adopt or reject his opinions as they see fit, without incurring the displeasure or the rebuke of the Church through her officers.' "

This communication is reprinted in the New York *Freeman's Journal* of Feb. 6th, 1904. In the same issue we read at the end of a short editorial:

"The conclusion is that the Church has neither confirmed them [the principles of Henry George and Dr. McGlynn] as true nor condemned them as false. This is the status of the Georgian Land Theory at present. It is an open question; the Catholic is free to advocate or condemn it, but he is not free to adduce the authority of the Church as an argument against it, has no grounds to say that the Church condemned it."

It is the purpose of this paper, the last of a series, to show that the view of Dr. McGlynn's restoration expressed in the quotations just given, is absolutely untenable. What judgment on Dr. McGlynn's teaching did "ecclesiastical authority," "the Holy See," or "the Church," give on the occasion of his reinstatement by the Apostolic Delegate, Dec. 23rd, 1892? Let us review the facts connected with that event, as they were published at the time through the press.

A despatch from Washington, dated Jan. 14th, 1893, contained the following passage:

"Msgr. Satolli authorizes the publication of the following statement in regard to the Pope's action in the case of Dr. McGlynn:—'On the very day of the reconciliation of Dr. McGlynn with the Church public notice was given of it with the statement that Msgr. Satolli had absolved from censure and reconciled Dr. McGlynn by special power for the purpose, requested from and granted by the Holy Father, and, moreover, that the absolution had been given because Dr. McGlynn had willingly accepted the conditions laid down by the Holy Father as necessary and sufficient.' "

Further on the conditions of the reconciliation were stated

thus: "The conditions were in this form: Dr. McGlynn had presented a brief statement of his opinions on moral-economic matters, and it was judged not contrary to the doctrine constantly taught by the Church and as recently confirmed by the Holy Father in the encyclical Rerum Novarum. Also it is hereby publicly made known that Dr. McGlynn, besides professing his adherence to all the doctrines and teachings of the Catholic Church, has expressed his regret, (saying that he would be the first to regret it) for any word or act of his that may have seemed lacking in the respect due to ecclesiastical authority, and he thereby intends to repair, as far as he can, any offence which may have been given to Catholics. Finally, Dr. McGlynn has of his own free will declared and promised that, within the limits of a not long period of time, he will go to Rome in the spirit and intention which are becoming to a good Catholic and a priest."

Note appended: "Dr. McGlynn says that he knows that the despatch from Washington containing a statement the publication of which is said to be authorized by the Apostolic Delegate, is genuine and authentic, and that he will make the statement the subject of his talk at Cooper Union to-night. He will make an additional statement of his own." New York *Herald*, Jan. 15th, 1893.

At the meeting which was held at Cooper Union in the evening of Jan. 15th, 1893, Dr. McGlynn read both the letter addressed by himself to the Apostolic Delegate and the above-mentioned "brief statement of his opinion on moral-economic matters."

According to the *World*, Jan. 16th, 1893, Dr. McGlynn said:

"Now that, as is made clear by the published statement of Archbishop Satolli, we are relieved from the restraint of certain considerations of prudence and delicacy, I am only too happy to publish the letter which I presented to the Apostolic Delegate, and his acceptance of which was immediately followed by the declaration of the removal of the ecclesiastical censures, and by this publication to reaffirm the sentiments which it contains. The letter is as follows:

" 'Monsignor: I am very happy to learn that it has been judged that there is nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine in the doctrine taught by me, as it was explained by me in the exposition of the same which I sent to Your Grace, and I rejoice that you are prepared to remove the ecclesiastical censures. I assure you that I have never said, and I would never say, consciously a word contrary to the teachings of the Church and the Apostolic See, to which teachings, and notably to those contained in the encyclical Rerum Novarum, I give and have ever given a full adhesion, and if whatsoever word may have ever escaped me which might seem not entirely conformable to those teachings I would like to recall

it or to interpret it in a sense conformable to them. I have not consciously failed in the respect due to the authority of the Holy See; but if whatsoever word may have ever escaped me not conformable to the respect due to it, I should be the first to regret it and to recall it. As to the journey to Rome, I will make it within three or four months if the matter be not otherwise determined by the Holy Father. I am Your Grace's very obedient servant, Edward McGlynn.' "

What do we learn from these documents concerning the question we propose to answer?

(*To be concluded.*)

BOOK REVIEW AND LITERARY NOTE.

Hereafter, or the Future Life According to Science and Faith. By Rev. J. Laxenaire, D. D. Adapted from the French by Rev. J. M. Leleu. St. Louis, Mo. B. Herder. 30 cts. net.

This booklet discusses the most serious of questions briefly but in a very readable manner. Its aim is "to throw light which emanates from the threefold focus of experience, reason, and revelation upon the great question of the hereafter." The rapid sketch of the beliefs of the principal nations of antiquity concerning the survival of the soul after death, shows what a firm root the doctrine had taken in pre-Christian religions. The objection of Delitzsch that it was not found among the Hebrews, is briefly answered. The author does well in quoting the admissions of materialists like Moleschott, who says that "only thirty days," and not seven years, "are necessary to give the body a new composition"; and of Flourens, "that all parts of the body, even the bones, transform themselves perpetually." For such facts will perhaps more readily than abstract philosophic proofs, convince some that in this constant process of wearing and replacement of bodily tissues, a superior vital force different from the body, must remain. And this is none other than the soul. The author then brings forward the arguments from the sense of justice so deeply engraved in the heart of man, and which has ever been looked upon as a strong proof for a future life. Arguments from the necessity of a sanction of the moral order and the desire for happiness conclude the little treatise, which deserves the attention of those who would like to have in a small compass and popular language our chief proofs for the existence of life after death.

——Reviewing the fourth volume of the Görres Society's monumental work on the Council of Trent (Concilium Tridentinum.

Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatuum Nova Collectio, etc. Friburgi Brisgoviae. Sumptibus Herder), Msgr. Laughlin says in the October number of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, p. 816: "We pray God to prosper this huge undertaking, which will shed such lustre upon the Catholic science of our generation, and we sincerely trust that the great publishing house which shouldered the immense enterprise will come out of it without serious financial loss. The 'Concilium Tridentinum' alone would suffice to immortalize and endear to Catholics the name of Herder."

MINOR TOPICS.

Politics in Mexico.—They have recently again had a presidential election in our neighboring republic, Mexico. These elections, as most of our readers probably know, are pure farces. A reliable correspondent in the city of Mexico writes about the one of last June:

"In all cases, the slates previously prepared by the machine in power were confirmed, practically without opposition—indeed, quite generally without opposition candidates at all; but the empty forms of the constitution were as scrupulously followed as though the contests were real and the interest of the people at large keen. Election boards were organized and proclaimed by executive authority beforehand, and polling-places carefully specified. In the majority of cases, it is doubtful if these polling-places were even open; however, there was no offence in this, for no voters except a sufficient few to cast a show of ballots for the precincts in question knew of the election or paid any attention to it. A prominent Mexican banker, for instance, asked if he attended the election, replied that he had forgotten on just what day it was held, and it 'was not necessary' to bother about it, as everything was fixed and would be attended to in due form by the officials and employés of government concerned. Some so-called 'popular meetings' were, to be sure, held; but, beyond gathering in small crowds to hear the music and perhaps lend a non-understanding ear to the speeches of the organizers, the proletariat had no interest in what was described by the government press as 'spontaneous demonstrations of the masses.' The poll lists and election returns were, in general, arranged in the capital of a district covering from two to nine hundred square miles, sometimes more."

Now that the likelihood of revolution has receded into the background in Mexico, and a rivalry for the presidency would probably not degenerate into a civil war between two claimants, it would be a good thing for the country to have something like a chance to test its constitution in a real election. Those like that held this year are the merest mimicry of constitutionalism, and, if long persisted in, will inevitably tend, not towards implanting a real con-

stitutionalism, but towards a total incapacitation for the exercise, even by the limited number of educated Mexicans, of the rights supposed to belong to the citizens of a republic. The old dictatorship, the one which in the nature of things must soon reach its end, has rested upon the vigor and the will of one man, whose prestige in the first instance was that of a military conqueror; the new dictatorship, unless indeed there be a sufficient leaven of patriotism and intelligence in the country to prevent it, will be a dictatorship of powerful commercial interests. The boast of the admirers of Diaz is that, by rigorously reëstablishing order and maintaining it, he has given opportunity for the development of the country, especially by foreign capital; and, by the diffusion throughout the country of railroads, the telegraph, and industrial enterprises generally, has made a return to the old days of revolution impossible. These great interests, coming, as stated, in large part from outside, have now set their stake upon a continuance of the policy under which they have been established. They will not leave that policy to chance, but will seek to insure their own future, and, if necessary, will exercise the tremendous power they now have in the country, even to the point of making the office of president one of their assets.

Light From India on our Philippine Question.—The N. Y. *Evening Post* (Oct. 11th) adduces some "testimony from India" to light up our Philippine question. It quotes from a recent book on 'New India, or India in Transition,' by Sir Henry John Stedman Cotton, K. C. S. I., who has served thirty-five years as a member of the Indian civil service, and so knows whereof he speaks. His father and grandfather were members of this service before him. His son has taken up the same career. He tells a story of India, which, though not mentioning the Philippines, would be just as useful to the Americans were they to substitute "the Philippines" every time the word "India" occurs, and similarly Manila for Calcutta, Bagnio for Simla, and Luke Wright for Lord Curzon. This book is in line, not with the superficial impressions of the casual traveler, but with the solid teaching of the best students, and with American experience at home and abroad. It is one of the glories of the English nation that its civil servants in India can tell the truth without fear or favor.

"The conditions of our occupation [of India] show," writes this latest reviewer of the situation, "a waning enthusiasm on the part of English officials, occasioned by a livelier consciousness of the drawbacks of Indian life; and a greater friction between the governors and the governed, attributable to many causes, but especially to the arrogance in thought and language of the ruling race, which has been brought out into stronger relief by the extension of education and the growth of independence and patriotic feeling among the people." Sir Henry Cotton expressed these same ideas in a book twenty years ago. After thinking on the question for that period, he brings out a new edition, stating his position still more emphatically.

Why should there be "friction" between the English and the natives in India? Why should there be friction between the Americans and the natives in the Philippine Islands? Why should there be friction between the white race and the colored in our

own country? These questions are all of a piece, and yet in the face of an American race question of the most tragic character, which is little, if any, nearer settlement to-day than it was in 1860, there is a phase of American optimism which rushes boldly forward to claim that: "The American people always settles its great questions right; it is the spirit of our nation and the genius of our people to deal justly, and the Filipinos, misled at first by thinking that we might be covetous like the Spaniards, can not help coming to see how full of love for them we really are." The question may be pertinently asked: How many more lynchings per annum in America would be sufficient to put a stop to this nonsense? Apparently the present number is insufficient. The collapse of our judicial system in the South, as it affects the negro, is insufficient. We must go abroad for more experience.

Dom Gasquet on Wolsey and Divorce.—Among the lectures delivered by Dom Francis Aidan Gasquet, the famous English historian, during his recent visit to the United States, was one on "Wolsey and Divorce." The divorce referred to is, of course, that of Henry VIII. and Catherine of Arragon, which was the direct cause of the Reformation in England—a country which had staunchly held to Catholicity for over a thousand years. It has been denied by eminent historians like Gardiner and Brewer, that Wolsey was the originator of this divorce. Dom Gasquet however says*) that "the weight of contemporary evidence as to the complicity of Wolsey is overwhelming.....Queen Catherine wrote to the Emperor Charles that Wolsey was the author of all her misfortune and misery, and the Emperor proclaimed it as a fact everywhere. A writer in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1877, has stated some interesting facts about the tradition as to Wolsey's culpability among English Catholics. He points out that, if, as a body, they had any bias, it would have been in favor of attributing all their misfortunes to Henry's unclean passion for Anne Boleyn. But as a fact, there is a strong consensus of opinion finding in Wolsey the origin of the divorce."

According to the lecturer, Shakespeare stated the position of Wolsey most correctly. However, the question as to whether Wolsey originated the divorce is "of academic rather than of real interest. Those who are so anxious to clear Wolsey's honor of this stain, forget that his memory must ever be burdened with heavier charges." He was responsible for the failure of the English policy in France.

There were more grounds for the divorce than Henry's love for Anne Boleyn. The validity of Catherine's marriage was questionable, and besides no children had blessed her union with Henry. Wolsey was a time-server and saw his own gain in the successful culmination of the divorce proceeding. His downfall was as surely foreshadowed by its failure. In the opinion of Dom Gasquet his complicity is established beyond a shadow of doubt.

The lecture closed with an account of Wolsey's repentance and charitable acts among the poor after his honors and titles had been taken away. Despite his many sins, his love of power, and

*) Our quotations are from the Notre Dame Scholastic, xxxviii, 6

his apparent confidence in the transient things of this world, he turned at last, chastened by tribulation, to Him "with whom there is no variableness," and died a good man.

Bishop McQuaid on Fraternal Insurance.—The venerable Bishop McQuaid, of Rochester, in his capacity of supreme spiritual director of the L. C. B. A., has addressed to the members of that society a letter, which we find in the *Fraternal Leader* for September, and which deserves to be quoted here. The Bishop says, among other things: "We have to bear in mind that fraternal organizations are of very recent origin. Their founders had little or no experience. Their arguments were not based on practical knowledge, and their consequent deductions proved fallacious. Catholic fraternal organizations followed the lead of non-Catholic ones and blundered as they had blundered. Experience soon taught both that they were making promises which could not be kept; knowingly to make such promises is criminal, as any master of moral theology can decide. The organizers of fraternal organizations were in good faith. They judged that by keeping down expenses along many lines, there would be no need of charging for insurance the heavy premiums required in the old-line companies. To some extent this was true, but not to the extent guessed at. When time demonstrated to the fraternal organizations that their rates of assessment were too low to enable them to keep their promises to their members, they called to their assistance, in a national congress, professional actuaries, who, after a diligent examination of the rate of mortality in fraternal organizations based on the reports of said organizations during the years of their existence, and determined on the life expectancy for each from 18 to 49, on this calculation decided the amount to be paid in each monthly installment on a safe and permanent rate. From this rate, decided on by competent experts, there can be little deviation."

Bishop Matz on Socialism in Colorado.—The Bishop of Denver, we note from a sermon recently preached by him and reproduced in the *Denver Catholic* (v, 32), attributes the responsibility for the late unfortunate labor disturbances in Colorado, which have made the fair name of the State a by-word throughout the Union, and cost a number of human lives and fifty millions of dollars in money, to Socialism.

"At the time when the strike was called," he said, "our laborers were getting the best wages ever paid in Colorado. All was harmony between miners and mine owners until the Socialist agitators appeared on the grounds. This harmony was so pronounced that these leaders despaired of their nefarious scheme if the vote in favor of a strike were left with the miners themselves who were immediately interested. Hence, to accomplish their purpose, the power of declaring a strike was wrested from the hands of the miners and lodged with the Socialistic leaders, who, without any provocation, on a flimsy pretext, gave the order which threw some 10,000 men out of employment. This was followed by intimidation, threats, violence, arson, dynamite, and wholesale slaughter

of innocent victims....Here the principle is Socialism, and its consequences in Colorado are marked by monumental ruins piled up in our fair Centennial State; ruins, reckoned by over fifty millions of dollars wasted; oceans of privations and sufferings entailed upon the laboring classes, and a heap of dead and mangled human beings. As a minister of the Gospel and chief shepherd of the flock, it is our bounden duty to denounce such crimes and expose the damnable principles whence they emanate, leaving the law to pillory the perpetrators of such outrages against humanity."

The Taste for Conquest.—Not long ago (Oct. 11th) the Boston *Transcript* quoted in its Washington correspondence an army officer of prominence, who graduated near the head of his class at West Point and is now in middle life, as follows: "I wish the United States would bring on war against England on any conceivable pretext, in order that we might grab Canada." When the point was raised that to subjugate the Canadians, with their devoted loyalty to the British crown, would bring ill-natured subjects to our flag, the officer replied that people learned to endure what they could not cure."

Is it unlikely that some American president, in the long line that is before us, may take this view, and involve the country in war with Great Britain? "Our country, right or wrong," would then become the cry. Criticism of the president would be unpatriotic. If the war was a success, he would go down into history as a greater statesman than McKinley, and greater than Polk, because Canada as a piece of real estate is probably worth more than what we took from Mexico, in furtherance of the slaveholders' conspiracy, and worth infinitely more than the Philippine Islands. It therefore appears that the ethical question involved in the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands against the will of their inhabitants, after they reach a tolerable standard of preparation, is one which will rise over and over again, so long as our history lasts and until it is settled. It neither begins nor ends with the Philippine archipelago.

Mary's Blessing on Our Schools.—Cardinal Moran, of Sydney, Australia, in an admirable pastoral letter on the jubilee of the Immaculate Conception [quite the best we have yet seen] says:

"Let us seek Mary's blessing upon our Catholic schools, that they may be perfected and multiplied. They are the fruit of our loyalty to the faith of the Gospel. By them we raise up children to God and good citizens to society. In their defence we are by the power of divine grace prepared to withstand to the end unjust, and therefore unwise, hostility, secular or sectarian, but without the bitterness of mere self-interest. God's own is this work, God's own by excellence. He will provide for us in all necessities. The Royal Psalmist's words may be applied to the enemies of Catholic education and of our children: 'Thou hast hated them that regard vanities to no purpose....I will be glad and rejoice in Thy mercy; for thou hast regarded my humility; Thou hast saved my soul out of distresses, and Thou hast not shut me

up in the hands of the enemy.' (Psal. xxx, 8, 9.)" [Quoted from the text of the pastoral in the Sydney *Catholic Press*, No. 455.]

College Fraternities and Greek Letter Societies were declared to be a menace to the welfare of high-schools and colleges by Professor William Schuyler of the McKinley High-School at the joint meeting of the Missouri College and High-School Union held in St. Louis on Nov. 5th. Professor Schuyler contended (*vide* St. Louis *Republic*, Nov. 6th) that these societies have a tendency to create a class spirit and a sentiment for exclusiveness among the students which, he said, is entirely at variance with the true spirit that should prevail in every school. He said that there is among these secret society members a tendency to care more for the fraternities than for the institution, and that they also engender in the mind of the student the idea that the fraternity is better than and sub-ordinate to the college.

Professor Morrison of the McKinley High School said that if there is any advantage in having these societies in colleges, they certainly have proved a great disadvantage in the high-schools, and that they should be vigorously opposed in these institutions.

——As we have no personal acquaintances in Vienna, we submit the following request of our friend Martin I. J. Griffin to our readers, among whom there are a number of native Austrians:

"How can I reach some one in Vienna who will make researches for me? I am told that the Dean of Vienna has the 'Berichte der Leopoldinenstiftung.' Father Kemper, of Davenport, examined them there a few years ago, but can not help me to get at them. I would like to get some one who for a reasonable compensation would go through these reports and cull out everything of U. S. interest; if competent also to translate into English; but that could be done here if I got the original. The early Church in Pennsylvania was by a large majority German, not Irish. Yet there is a dearth of information, Dr. Shahan, when in Berlin, sent me an important item he found in an old magazine. So there must be MSS. as well as printed matter of value. I want to get at some of it, so as to even up our historical position hereabouts. I have plenty of material to print, but like a miser am ever seeking more."

If any one among our readers can help Mr. Griffin in this matter, he is kindly requested to communicate with that insatiable delver in historic records at 2009 N. Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

——In an article on Freemasonry in *Munsey's Magazine* for October, Edward A. Quick, "Historian of the Grand Lodge of New York," defends the religious principles of the order. He says: "The ancient constitutions contain the following concerning this subject: A Mason is obliged by his tenure to obey the moral law; and if he rightly understands the art, he will never be a stupid atheist nor an irreligious libertine." But how are these qualifying words to be interpreted? The present age has evolved a multi-

tude of conceited atheists who proudly boast of having outgrown belief in the supernatural and who are by no means looked upon as stupid by their fellows. We have also heard a great deal of late about cultured and refined libertines. Are we to look upon such men as products of Masonic morality? Are they of the class that has learnt "the art" of obeying the moral law?

——According to a despatch from Dallas, jurists, preachers, and other men of influence have issued a call for a State convention to consider the divorce evil, which is assuming alarming proportions in Texas. The convention is to meet at Dallas, Nov. 21st, and the invitation is addressed to "all persons of whatever creed or calling who believe it is their duty to do all in their power to stem the current of easy divorce from the marriage tie." The object is to appeal to the next legislature to pass laws to check "the divorce tide, which," the despatch says (cfr. St. Louis *Republic*, Nov. 6th), "is running high in every court of jurisdiction in the State." We hope Catholics will participate in the Dallas anti-divorce convention.

——Since 1880 there has been quite an increase in the number of fires and in the amount of property loss through fire in this country. A writer in the N. Y. *Evening Post* [Oct. 8th] shows that the gradual increase of proportion is mainly due to powerful electric energy, and explains the principal causes of such fires. His conclusion is: "Some of the so-called safety precautions as now applied to electric light and railway circuits are really proving to be more detrimental than beneficial. A higher standard of electric light, telephone, bell, annunciator, signaling, and other similar wire installation in buildings, is necessary in order to prevent fires by the present electric light and trolley railway circuit grounding practices."

——Speaking of modern marriage customs, Archbishop Bruchesi, of Montreal, says in a pastoral letter recently issued: "I profit by this occasion to tell you how deplorable I find certain habits which have introduced themselves upon the subject of marriage, and which tend to become more and more general. Truly, we seem to forget that marriage is a sacrament of our holy religion. The newspapers describe the bride's apparel as though it were one for a ball; they must enumerate the presents received, and give all the other worldly details. Everyone seems to put a veritable rivalry into this. Where, then, are the simple usages of our fathers? Where are our Christian sentiments?"

——In *Le Correspondant* (Sept. 10th) J. E. Bourg more than hints that Spain has not lost but gained by parting with Cuba and the Philippines, since from these losses date the awakening of the national conscience and the turning over of a new leaf. Moreover, it gives capital and labor to the much distressed agricultural districts at home, and, thanks to important reforms in drainage, improved methods of irrigation, and similar indispensable conditions of good farming, the country will soon supply the home

market and dispense with imported produce. Commerce and the industrial arts, says M. Bourg, have progressed beyond the expectations of the most sanguine.

——"I am not in politics, never have been and never will be, and I want none of my priests to be politicians. Catholics may belong to any political party whose principles are not in opposition to the laws of God; but they can not be Socialists, for Socialism is condemned by the Church. Its principles involve the denial of the very existence of God, the destruction of all religion, and the ruin of society. Therefore by warning against Socialism we are fighting the battle of our God and of our country, since the fundamental principles of both are involved in this issue."—Bishop Matz, of Denver, quoted in the *Denver Catholic*, v, 33.

——We have an enquiry regarding the character of the secret or semi-secret society called "Hermannssöhne" (Sons of Arminius), which for lack of authentic material we are unable to answer. We remember that the *Ohio Waisenfreund*, published by the Papal College Josephinum, in its edition of Nov. 18th, 1903, expressed the conviction that the "Hermannssöhne," no matter how harmless they may appear, undoubtedly belong to the societies forbidden by the Church." The Benedictine Fathers of Mt. Angel, Ore., in a recent issue of their *St. Joseph's Blatt*, took the same position. Can any one of our readers procure us a copy of the constitution, the ritual, etc., of this order?

——Cereal coffee, as made and prescribed by the late Father Kneipp, was not only an innocuous, but also a healthful drink. He used the best quality of cereals, but some of the imitators who advertise their cereal coffee so widely in our newspaper press, finding it necessary, on account of heavy advertising expense, to put up an article that costs very little, largely use damaged grain. Fortunately, the injury likely to arise from this cause is lessened on account of the intense heat used in roasting and boiling this so-called coffee.

——Archbishop Bruchesi, of Montreal, in his latest pastoral letter, asks the rectors of his Diocese to "abstain from publishing in the newspapers the musical program which they will present on grand feasts. It is necessary, when it is a question of something so grand as religious worship, that everything that resembles the concert or outward show be done away with."

——And still they come! According to the St. Louis *Republic* (Nov. 6th), the "Order of the Maccabees," a semi-secret fraternal insurance society, has appointed a commission to reconstruct its assessment rates.

——We learn from the *Vérité Française* (No. 4073) that the canonical process for the beatification of the Venerable Duns Scotus will soon terminate favorably,